

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-11, and 13-23 are now pending. Applicants have amended claims 7, 9, 11, and 13 and cancelled claims 8 and 12.

The Examiner has rejected claims 9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended a minor typographical error in these claims.

Applicants' technology operates in a multithreaded environment, such as the multithreaded architecture ("MTA"). To understand applicants' technology, the difference between a processor, a stream, a task, and a thread needs to be clear. The MTA supports multiple "streams" executing simultaneously in a processor. An MTA processor contains a complete set of registers for each stream. An MTA processor can execute a different thread of execution in each stream. (Applicants' Specification, p. 1.) A task, which can be considered to be an application or a user program, is divided into threads that represent separately schedulable units of the task.

Thus, a stream is not a thread. A stream is a resource of a processor that can be assigned to a task for executing a thread. For example, one MTA processor has 128 streams and thus has 128 complete sets of registers. A task can have a variable number of threads such as 1 or 1000. A task may be assigned a certain number of streams, for example, 16 and can have 16 of its threads executing on the assigned streams simultaneously.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hogle and claims 1-6, 11, and 13-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogle in view of Jones. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 1-7, 9-11 and 13-23 are directed to "returning" or "assigning" a "stream" to a "task" or a "user program." Neither reference cited by the Examiner has anything to do

with such "streams." The Hogle reference does not use the term "stream" or any language that could possibly correspond to such a stream. The Jones reference uses the term "stream," but only in the context of a "video stream," which is unrelated to a "stream of a processor." Because the cited references neither teach nor suggest anything related to such streams or the returning or assigning of such streams, the claims cannot be anticipated by or obvious in view of the cited references.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 324758001US3 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Dated: September 14, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio

Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicants